

**REMARKS**

**Introduction**

Claims 1-8 are pending, with claim 1 being independent.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct informalities in claim language and to more clearly define the present subject matter. Claims 9-21 have been cancelled without prejudice. Support for the amendment is found, for example, at paragraph [0072] of the present specification. Care has been taken to avoid introducing new matter.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

**Substance of Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and courtesy during an interview conducted with the Applicants' representative on September 3, 2009. During the interview, it was argued that Fraser fails to disclose that the program is loaded to the client device, with which the Examiner agreed.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 5, 9-10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fraser (USP 6,895,502). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that, at a minimum, Fraser fails to disclose that the client device is configured to "*access the anti-tampering memory area and the non-volatile memory area in response to an access request via the common interface in the storage medium,*" "*the*

*common interface [is] configured to issue a plurality of sequential responses to the access request,” “an access for the non-volatile memory area [is] arranged to be saved when the access request is made before a last response of the plurality of sequential responses,” and “the access for the non-volatile memory area being performed after the last response reaches,” as recited by amended claim 1.*

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are patentable over Fraser. Thus, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser, and further in view of Knegendorf et al. (USP Publication 2003/040929). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser, and further in view of Ugajin (USP 5,652,892). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser, and further in view of Gould et al. (USP 6,920,561). Claims 9-10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser, and further in view of Ugajin et al. (US 2004/0186961). Claims 11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser, and further in view of Yoon et al. (USP 6,088,794). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fraser, and further in view of Golding et al. (USP 5,265,163). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) predicated upon Fraser. The additional cited references do not teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1, from which claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend, which are missing from Fraser. Therefore, any combination of the cited references would still fail to disclose these claimed features, and it would not have been obvious to add these features to any combination of the cited references.

As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2-4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**Conclusion**

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Takashi Saito  
Limited Recognition No. L0123

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 TS:llg  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: November 6, 2009**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**